

to change their Nation in a way they see fit to change it, to protect the Social Security system, to assure that the Government governs properly but, most importantly, to look to the future and to honor the future.

Today we saw a Senate that looked backward. We saw a Senate that said that the past is better than the future. Are we going to be guardians of the past, or are we truly going to be the visionaries of the future? I suggest that the American people, in November, were talking of our future. They were most assuredly not talking of our past—for the past is \$4.8 trillion of debt.

This body—all of us, all Senators alike—has to take the responsibility for that debt. And today and for the last 5 weeks, we have struggled to give one moment of time in history to the American people. So they could choose how we would handle that debt. Yet, the central power and the central wisdom prevailed today. I suggest that it is not the wisdom of the American people, nor was it their wish.

So ORRIN HATCH, LARRY CRAIG and, hopefully, PAUL SIMON, before he retires, will have an opportunity to come to the floor of the Senate again, once the American people have recognized that President Clinton denied them that opportunity today, that he once again backtracked away from his pledge to the American people that he would progressively and in a positive sense bring down the deficit. This year, in his budget resolution, he walked away and denied what was once a promise and a pledge.

I suggest that the American people will not be denied, and they will have the opportunity to change the organic law like other Congresses in the past have seen the wisdom to allow them that choice.

I am amazed, Mr. President; I am absolutely amazed that even one Senator would not allow the citizens of his or her State the right to make a choice. But that was denied today—falsely denied, wrongly denied. I suggest that those citizens, in the long-term, will not be denied.

It has been a tremendous opportunity for me and for all of those colleagues who have joined with me in this issue and in this debate. And I would agree with the Senator from West Virginia, it has been a positive debate. It has been most constructive, and all ramifications of the issue have been thoroughly brought to this floor, some falsely, some under improper clothing or dress, some presented in ways that were illusory and not fact.

But the reality is that in the end this is an issue that will not go away and it will ultimately prevail.

Mr. President, I want to thank all of those who have joined with me, and most assuredly my staff, for their tremendous dedication as we brought this issue to the floor.

And I wish to thank the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, BOB DOLE, for offering the tremendous leadership

and taking the kinds of risks that must be taken as a leader to allow the American people their right to govern us.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

EXTENDING MORNING BUSINESS UNTIL 4:15 P.M.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 4:15 p.m. today, under the same terms and conditions as previously ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

I am a supporter of this amendment. I voted for the amendment, and I will vote for it again if it comes up in a similar form that it came up now.

But I have a parliamentary inquiry. When the majority leader changed his vote from "yes" to "no" and did not make the motion to reconsider, is it within the province of the majority leader at any time at any place as long as the Senate is in session to move without debate to the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it is.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, may I have another 60 seconds?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield the Senator an additional 60 seconds.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am for this amendment. There has been a little bit of blood that has been spilled on the floor here in the last couple of days, especially when the unanimous consent to vote at a certain time was obviated by our being pushed into a recess, a legitimate parliamentary move, but one that sort of violated the spirit of what everyone thought was going to happen.

I hope and I plead with the majority leader that when he moves to reconsider—and I will be with him; I will be for this under the following circumstance: as long as we all know it is going to be done and everyone is here. If the majority leader called for a motion to reconsider knowing that there were absences that would affect the outcome of this vote, I would, on a matter of procedure, change my vote to prevent that happening. I do not think that is the majority leader's intention, but I do not want to mislead anybody. I think this is so important that this has to be dealt with straight up, with all 100 Senators, unless they are ill, in the hospital and cannot make it, that every consideration should be given to every Senator to be able to vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, a number of people have spoken, and I know others are waiting to speak. I do not want to be long.

Let me just say what I have said on several occasions, that we owe the American people our best effort. Before this amendment was to go out to be voted upon by the American people, we owed it our best effort. The amendment that was pending prior to the last vote is not our best effort. Accordingly, the Senate has acted wisely in refusing to endorse this particular proposal to amend our Constitution.

Those who stood against it did so for good reasons. Supporters refused to guarantee that Social Security would be protected.

The prospects for this amendment were entirely in the hands of the majority. It was their choice.

Until 2 days ago, Senators were asked to bet on the chance that a new and different Senate 7 years from now would honor promises made by Members of this Senate.

Two days ago, for the first time, the majority conceded that they indeed intend to do exactly what we and seniors feared—use the Social Security trust funds to balance the budget. In a last-minute attempt to secure one more vote for this proposal, they offered to stop raiding the trust funds in 2012. The offer was later modified to 2010 and, finally, to 2008.

They missed the point. Those of us fighting to protect Social Security believe the retirement funds Americans have paid into the Social Security trust funds should be left untouched, period. Every American who has paid into the system has a right to expect those funds to stay there and be available to them when it is their turn to collect them.

For the majority to agree to stop using those funds to buy down the debt after virtually all those funds are gone reflects a cynicism that is solely disappointing. As the Senator from north Dakota has stated so well, balancing the budget by depleting the Social Security trust funds is not balancing the budget at all.

During this debate, 43 motions and amendments were offered, many of which would have substantially improved the proposals. Forty-two were rejected, essentially along partisan lines.

We offered language to guarantee the future of the Social Security System. Several Democratic Senators stated explicitly they would support the amendment if Social Security were protected.

We offered language to protect against unconstitutional Presidential impoundments; language to give States

a right to know what this amendment would mean to them; language to protect veterans' health and pension benefits; language to preserve our ability to respond to economic and national security emergencies. All of those proposals were rejected.

This is no ordinary debate because it is our Constitution we are being asked to amend. When the stakes are so high, the substance so serious, the proposed changes well-tested, the out-of-hand rejection of those amendments is extremely disappointing. That is the reason the amendment failed.

Finally, supporters of this amendment refused, for the full 4 weeks that it has been debated, to come forward and offer any realistic outline of a plan by which a balanced budget could be credibly produced in 2002.

Yet, outside this Chamber, supporters of the balanced budget amendment have been willing to say that passing the balanced budget amendment will not balance the budget at all.

That is right. It will not.

Recently, when he was asked whether the Congress would approve the balanced budget amendment, Speaker GINGRICH said, "For as long as I'm allowed to serve as Speaker, whether we do or not, the House will make decisions based on achieving a balanced budget in 2002 with or without the balanced budget amendment."

The majority leader restated his intention to do that today.

The Speaker's words reflect the fact that the ability to balance or unbalance the budget remains unchanged: it is in the hands of the majority in the Congress.

Indeed, a failure to act as he has promised will serve to confirm that the purpose of this debate was to create a rationale for not moving to balance the budget any time soon; that the debate's purpose was to be able to say, we're waiting for the States to ratify.

One month from today, on April 1, the Budget Committee is required by law to report a budget resolution to the Senate. Two weeks later, by April 15, the Congress is required, by law, to give final approval to a budget resolution for the coming year.

In 44 days, Congress must have debated, conferenced, and given final approval to a budget for fiscal year 1996. That is an obligation of this Congress, not the 107th.

That is a responsibility for all of us serving now, not people who will serve in the year 2002. It is what our job is this year, not some other person's job in some future time.

Nothing has changed the magnitude of the job ahead of us.

I have said consistently since the beginning of this debate and the beginning of this session that it is our desire to work cooperatively, particularly in getting the deficit under control.

The Republican majority is in control of the Congress. I hope the Republican majority will adhere to the time requirements of the Budget Act, which are a matter of law. The budget resolu-

tion must be written, and action completed soon. Committees need to know their authorized allocations for programs. We should be getting down to work on the budget now, because we do not have much time.

We have 44 days.

The budget is not going to be balanced in 2002 unless the responsible people in 1995 start to focus on their share of the work.

It is time we stopped worrying about the responsibilities of future Congresses and started to discharge the responsibilities that belong to each of us as Members of this Congress this year.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask that I have 2 minutes following the distinguished Democratic leader to respond to a number of things that have been put in the RECORD in the last few minutes that should not be left unanswered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I beg the indulgence of my colleagues who have been here on the floor waiting to speak. I would like to take this opportunity to respond, for just a few minutes, to a few things that have been said.

First, the Senator from Delaware raised some concerns about the distinguished majority leader's intention for the motion to reconsider.

He said he would be inclined to support that, but it was essential that there be notice given before that vote could occur. Frankly, I think it is out of order to even imply that the majority leader would do anything other than give ample notice. That is just what he did today. We had the vote shortly after 2 o'clock. It was agreed to. Notification was given.

I want to assure my colleagues that the distinguished majority leader does not participate in sneak tactics. He will notify the Chamber when there will be a vote on a motion to reconsider the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

But I do warn my colleagues, that vote will come again. Today the American people lost. The liberals who want to keep on spending just the way they have for the 22 years I have been watching them here in the Congress, the same old tax-and-spend liberals, won today. But there will be another day for the people to try again with the balanced budget amendment. Under this motion to reconsider, they will have that opportunity sometime during the remainder of this 104th Congress.

Now, with regard to what the distinguished Democratic leader just had to say, some Senators continue to imply that there is some difference between this year's balanced budget amendment and the one we voted on last year. They are the same. Some Senators now say they opposed the amendment because they were worried about Social

Security. Where were they last year? They supported the same amendment.

So I would like to ask unanimous consent that the statements of Senator DASCHLE, Senator FORD, Senator HOLLINGS, Senator DORGAN, and Senator FEINSTEIN from last year—what they had to say last year about this very same language—be placed into the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this debate on a balanced budget amendment, we are being forced to face the consequences of our inaction. Quite simply, we are building a legacy of debt for our children and grandchildren and hamstringing our ability to address pressing national priorities * * * To remedy our fiscal situation, we must stop spending beyond our means. This will not require the emasculation of important domestic priorities, as some suggest.—Senator Thomas Daschle, (D-SD), Cong. Rec., S-1981, February 28, 1994.

I hear so much about if 40-some-odd Governors can operate a balanced budget, why can't the Federal Government * * * I operated under it. It worked * * * I think implementation of this amendment will work. I think we can make it work * * * I do not understand why it takes a brain surgeon to understand how you operate a budget the way the States do * * * This is an opportunity to pass a balanced budget amendment that will work and will give us a financially sound future, not only for ourselves but for our children and our grandchildren.—Senator Wendell Ford, D-KY, Cong. Rec., S-2058, March 1, 1994.

I could offer my colleagues 3.5 trillion reasons for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution; that is the number of deficit dollars added to the national debt since 1981. But I will rest my case with one simple reason: It ought to be a minimal moral obligation of our national government to match its income with its expenditures on an annual basis * * * so that additional debt is not passed on to future generations.—Senator Ernest Hollings, D-SC, Cong. Rec., S-2075, March 1, 1994.

This deficit is not about some unusual investment that is going to yield enormous potential rewards. This is a structural operating budget deficit that represents a permanent, continual imbalance between what we raise and what we spend, and the Congress and the American people have conspired together in a way in our political system that prevents us from dealing with it. This constitutional amendment, no matter what one thinks of it, will add to the pressure that we reconcile what we spend with what we raise, and that we begin to assure a better economic future with economic growth and hope and opportunity for our children once again.—Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND), Cong. Rec., S-2068, March 1, 1994.

If in their heart of hearts they believe we are not going to be able to balance the budget under the current process, then I believe they should support the balanced budget amendment. At least that is the conclusion to which I have come. Without a constitutional amendment, a balanced budget just is not going to be achieved.—Senator Dianne Feinstein, D-CA, Cong. Rec., S-1831, February 24, 1994.

Mr. LOTT. Yet those Senators today voted against the balanced budget amendment.

Now, Mr. President, what has happened during this debate? What will

happen when we get to the serious budget votes? Will some Senators say, "Oh, yes, we want a balanced budget, but we have a right to know what will happen for years into the future," which is what they said a week ago. Will they say again, "We must have some further guarantees on Social Security," or else they won't even vote for deficit reduction now.

I will venture a prediction. I predict that they will say, "Exempt this group from any cuts, and exempt that group." And when we get to the budget resolution, they will say, "Oh, yes, by all means cut spending, but not here. Not there. Somewhere else."

Where will their votes be when we get to the real deficit reduction effort? Will they be saying, "Exempt my State, or exempt my region, or exempt this special interest"? Or will they be willing to cast the tough votes so that we can stop the \$200 billion-a-year deficits that President Clinton has proposed, not just for this year, but for as far as the eye can see?

Today advocates of the balanced budget amendment lost. But within 2 months, the Senate will have to face tough choices about spending, tough choices about specific programs. The Nation will be watching to see the votes that will then be cast by those who today profess devotion to a balanced budget, while voting against the amendment that would have achieved it.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. JEFFORDS and Mr. LEAHY pertaining to the introduction of S. J. Res. 28 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

PEACE AND FREEDOM

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, yesterday the majority leader gave a very important speech at the Nixon Center for Peace and Freedom and outlined what he called the five global realities that affect our vital interest and dictate what it will take to maintain leadership throughout the world.

First, the golden age of capitalism. From India and Latin America to China and Russia, 4 billion people formerly under some form of socialism are striving to establish market economies. This offers great opportunities for America and American business, but requires American leadership to protect our interests and ensure adherence to the rules of the international trading system.

Second, the new world energy order. Senator DOLE correctly noted that the security of the world's oil and gas supplies will remain a vital national interest. At the same time, Iran and Iraq remain hostile threats in the oil-rich gulf, while other energy rich areas in Eurasia are subject to disorder. He makes the insightful observation that "in this new energy order, many of the most important geopolitical deci-

sions—ones on which a nation's sovereignty can depend—will deal with the location and routes for oil and gas pipelines." I would add that we are already seeing in the case of Azerbaijan, over which Moscow is trying to regain effective control in order to determine the route through which Azeri oil will flow. Senator DOLE concluded that "our strategy, our diplomacy and our forward military presence need readjusting" to meet this reality.

Third, the spread of weapons of mass destruction. The majority leader issued a clarion call yesterday that "we must prepare now for the future," in which weapons of mass destruction will become more widespread, greatly affecting our vital security interests. He wisely asked "what would we have done—or not done—if Iraq had one or two nuclear weapons in 1990? A chilling question and one which we could face in just a few years as a real, not a hypothetical question, with regard to Iran or North Korea. In response to this threat, Senator DOLE quite rightly focused on the possibility of preventive military action and the need for missile defenses to protect America and our allies.

Fourth, increase in extremist religious and ethnic movements. The majority leader highlighted the many areas in which religious or ethnic passions have led to conflicts and identified those that pose a threat to American interests. America cannot become complacent he wisely warned his audience.

Fifth, rivalry with Russia. In perhaps in most important observations, Senator DOLE warned that "geopolitical rivalry with Russia did not end with the demise of Soviet communism." Quoting Henry Kissinger, he noted that the Soviet threat was one of both communism and imperialism, and while communism was defeated the trend toward imperialism remains. While an early supporter of President Yeltsin, Senator DOLE warned against "the Clinton administration's misguided devotion to a 'Russia First' policy, which has turned into a 'Yeltsin First' policy, and he quoted President Nixon who told the Duma "when we have differences, we should not assume they will be overcome by a good personal relationship even at the highest level." To buttress his case, the majority leader listed numerous examples of how Moscow has taken actions in recent months that are in conflict with U.S. interests.

To address this situation, Senator DOLE prescribed a "new realism" about Russia. This would not mean a return to the cold war past, he noted, but would require "developing a more honest relationship, one that does not paper over important policy differences with an appeal to personal ties."

In conclusion, Senator DOLE reaffirmed the need for American leadership to secure peace and freedom for future generations of Americans.

In an article just published in the current issue of Foreign Affairs, Sen-

ator DOLE builds on these themes and defines his vision for the future American role in the world and 10 principles to guide our international relations. He also provides an incisive critique of the Clinton administration's foreign policy and how and why it has, in Senator DOLE's view, failed in various respects.

I will merely quote the final paragraph of his article:

As the United States approaches the next century, two principles should remain constant: protecting American interests and providing American leadership. The end of the Cold War has provided us with a historic opportunity. Such an opportunity should not be forfeited in favor of the pursuit of utopian multilateralism or abandoned through intentional isolationism. We have seen the danger to America's interests, prestige, and influence posed by both of these approaches. Instead, we must look to the lessons of the Cold War to guide our future foreign policy: Put American interests first and lead the way. The future will not wait for America, but it can be shaped by an America second to none.

Mr. President, I think that in yesterday's speech and this new article with the majority leader has provided us with a clear vision and practical proposals for guiding American foreign policy. I would urge my colleagues to give the most careful attention to both these documents, and I would ask unanimous consent to insert them in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COHEN. In his speech yesterday, President Clinton also reaffirmed that he gives very high priority to ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Mr. President, there have been many supporters on this side of the aisle for efforts to control and ban chemical weapons—Senator DOLE, Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator HATFIELD, Senator MCCAIN and others come to mind, and I have been pleased to work with them on different measures to achieve that goal.

During the 1980's, I supported replacement of our aging chemical stocks with binary weapons, a necessary step to get Moscow to negotiate seriously.

EXHIBIT 1

FOREIGN POLICY—WINNING THE PEACE: AMERICAN LEADERSHIP AND COMMITMENT

(By Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole)

I can't help but think back to the day in January of 1994, when President Nixon made his last visit to the United States Capitol.

The occasion was the 25th anniversary of his inauguration as President. And over 100 past and present Senators and Congressmen—Republicans and Democrats alike—attended a lunch honoring President Nixon that Bob Michel and I hosted.

At the conclusion of the lunch, President Nixon stood—and without a note in his hand—delivered one of the most compelling speeches many of us could remember.

As always, he talked politics, and he also shared some personal reflections on his life and career. But the majority of his remarks